

from Washington was far below what was just; but for the sake of peace and quiet, at the end of five months, he was willing to take it. It should be remembered that each county and the city of Baltimore had a Senator. Nothing could become a law until it had passed the Senate. Gentlemen had mounted the negro hobby; although the slave interest was as well protected as it could be upon parchment. The Legislature had no power to pass a law to interfere with the relation of master and slave. It was contrary to the Constitution?

The gentleman from Somerset had complained of a change in his political course. That change had been made from the stronger to the weaker side; and was one of the proudest acts of his life.

Mr. Brown said that in 1836, he had voted for the compromise as such. He had taken for the smaller counties all he could get. The election of the Governor by the people was secured. It was a hard bargain; but they agreed to it. He proposed still to compromise, and to take but a portion of their rights. As to his retaining office by his change, the first information he had received of their intention to elect him, was the statement that he had been elected. If other proof were wanted of his disinterested motives, they had made the Constitution, and though elected for five years, had voted themselves out at the end of two.

Mr. CRISFIELD said he had not intended to involve himself in a controversy with the gentleman from Carroll. (Mr. Brown.) He had not designed to treat him unkindly, and he felt surprised at his reply. The gentleman had charged him with being an aristocrat.

Mr. Brown, interposing, said he had not charged the gentleman from Somerset with being an aristocrat.

Mr. CRISFIELD proceeded. The gentleman from Carroll had said, that he, (Mr. C.,) maintained that the majority had no right to govern, but that the minority had; and that those who deny the right of the majority to rule, were aristocrats at heart. He, [Mr. C.,] maintained no such proposition, and was not obnoxious to any such charge. What he had argued, was that checks must be imposed, sufficient to enable the weaker portions of society from being oppressed by the strong, but not so strong, as to defeat the will of the majority, any further than was necessary to give protection. This was but the doctrine of the act of 1836, which was voted for and maintained by the gentleman from Carroll. That gentleman now denounced that act as a yoke, which the majority might throw off. If that act was a yoke, who made it? It was the gentleman's act.

Mr. Brown said that only a portion of the yoke had been thrown off in 1836; he then wished to go further.

Mr. CRISFIELD. There was no evidence at the time the gentleman wished to go further.—He, [Mr. C.,] was here at that time, and never then heard from the gentleman, or any one else, that he wished to go further. The gentleman then acted with the friends of that measure, and

appeared satisfied with it. But he denounced it now as a yoke. How does it operate as a yoke? Who does it really injure? What was the practical real grievance? None has been shown.

The gentleman declared against territory being regarded as an element, affecting the distribution of representation; yet he maintained it in 1836, and maintains it now! The Senate was purely territorial, and that too, with the concurrence of the gentleman; and was it such a monstrous proposition to apply the same principle to the House? In the proposition of the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. Fiery] voted for and sustained by the gentleman from Carroll, (Mr. Brown,) the smaller counties were to have a representation distinct from population. The only difference between the gentleman and himself, was that he, [Mr. C.,] wished to give the territorial element a greater influence, than the gentleman from Carroll did.

The gentleman thought it was all wrong that we should mount what he is pleased to term the hobby of slavery, which he said had never been attacked, and was secure under the provision in the Constitution. Sir, [said Mr. C.,] that institution is not secure; it had been attacked here this day; it is attacked in the proposition to exclude the slaveholding counties from that power, which has heretofore been awarded to them, on account of their slaves. The constitutional guaranty is of but little real value. It will be of no avail when really needed; and will be changed or disobeyed, as soon as the counties, which are to have the power under this Constitution, if the gentleman succeeds, shall find it convenient to change or disobey it. Constitutional restraints are of little value, when those, whom they are intended to restrain, have the power to change them.

The gentleman says, the Whigs and Nullifiers were classed together in 1836, and he never was a Whig. Never was a Whig! Did the gentleman say so then? He was admitted into Whig counsels in 1836; he was in full communion with the Whig party at that time; did he tell those with whom he acted that he was not a Whig? Did he give them any reason to doubt his fidelity to that party? He accepted from the twenty-one electors, the very apostles of the Whig party, a seat in the Senate; did he tell them he was not a Whig? He took his seat as a Whig, he voted as a Whig; and not a hint was given at the time that he was not a Whig! If he were really not a Whig, why did he accept and wear the honors of the party? The gentleman claimed merit for having changed from the stronger to the weaker party; that may have been so, but that weaker party was strong enough to give him office, and did give him office; and he should communicate that fact when next he claims credit for disinterestedness. But he has changed again; and the last change was from the weaker to the stronger side; and he has received fresh honors from his new friends.

In referring to these changes when first up, Mr. C. said he had not designed to be unkind to the gentleman from Carroll; all he intended had